

Feeding people now!

I mean like feeding people like it was yesterday! many people in my country go hungry without food for a [long time](#) each time. i will get a way to feed them today, or drop dead.

The only way to feed them is to get food taken to them in trucks. this means getting them food from somewhere and sending it to them. let's say they have no money? this means tat someone else will have to pay for it, so we look to welfare, of course.

[The state](#) could so easily send them food. if they were to write a united nations law of human rights type, they could see this done right now, but, of course there must be a better way to do it.

So, the best way is to observe where the money will come from... why not make it a community thing? every place has a shopping center near it to make money. if the money they made was enough, well they could clear the store of old goods - not old food, only nearly going to expire things they wold throw away anyways - they could send it to the people at a reduced cost. of course, there should still be some money used up, so, the shop should join up with the state and get a welfare grant. instead of the state paying normal prices for goods, they could get it at nearly [cost price](#) from the store and send it to the people that need food and have no money. but, what does the state get out of this?

The state will get a healthy work force out of this. they could set it into the income tax of the workers maybe? i doubt it!

How about if the state was to tax nearby businesses more? this could see the businesses, like mines and factories - where the people settle - taxed [a little](#) more for the communities sake. i guarantee you that the business will not close down, as they make so much money off of the poor already with the cheapest labor in the neighborhood.

Then, they could feed these people [a little bit](#) at least. all in a web of taxation and welfare. but, what if the businesses had something to make out of this as well? let's leave nobody empty handed?

I suppose they could get people to work for them for free? they could always do with a bit of help, yes? if the people helped [the community](#), the sate helped the community and the stores helped the community, everybody scores!

New fund.

If the state was to take [more money](#) from the people, then it would have more money for services. i want to make though, a new way to just make money for the state without taking from the people, of course, as usual.

Now, if the state was to bring back gst, they would [make more money](#) from the higher classes and more money in total. this would bring down the price of bread and milk, but, let's say that they instead increased prices of bread and milk by a little tax of a few cents? this would be the 'bread tax' and could go into a fund for the poor. of course, it will affect the poor maybe a little bit too much, so maybe a new tax form could be taken into account? if the state was to raise taxation on the 'better goods,' like premium bread and milk, then they would be able to leave the taxes on bread and milk like they are for the poor, and instead bring in a fund

for the poorest to get food for free? maybe this will help, maybe not...

So, we need to increase taxation on bank transfers. everyday the rich and investors make a killing - or sometimes get killed - yet they would easily see [a little](#) more tax go unnoticed basically, yes?

Or, the businesses could contribute? if they were to donate a certain amount of money to the 'fund' i am sure they will go a long way. they could take about five percent more than tax from the people that work there, and then give like three percent to the 'fund.' this way the [business](#) will score, and the people that work there will be hard done by. so, lets make a plan for them too?

For the employees at each business, they could be offered in house prices for all goods! if they make milk, then they could take milk home for a reduced cost. this will make them better off, and the business will [be able to](#) satisfy the demand from the people that work for them in exchange for the goods they make or services rendered. this might mean the employees go out and start selling things for themselves - good for them too! as long as the employees, business and fund are satisfied, there will be more for all, all except the real fat cats. this is better than raising taxes on them.

Getting rid of tax havens!

 Quote by: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tax_haven

A tax haven is a state, country or territory where certain taxes are levied at a low rate or not at all.[2] Individuals or corporate entities can find it attractive to establish shell subsidiaries or move themselves to areas with reduced or nil taxation levels relative to typical international taxation. This creates a situation of tax competition among governments. Different jurisdictions tend to be havens for different [types of](#) taxes, and for different categories of people or companies.[3] States that are sovereign or self-governing under international law have theoretically unlimited powers to enact tax laws affecting their territories, unless limited by previous international treaties. There are several definitions of tax havens. The Economist has tentatively adopted the description by Geoffrey Colin Powell (former economic adviser to Jersey): "What ... identifies an area as a tax haven is the existence of a composite tax structure established deliberately to take advantage of, and exploit, a worldwide demand for opportunities to engage in tax avoidance." The Economist points out that this definition would still exclude a number of jurisdictions traditionally thought of as tax havens.[4] Similarly, others have suggested that any country which modifies its tax laws to attract foreign capital could be considered a tax haven.[5]

According to other definitions,[6] the central feature of a haven is that its laws and other measures can be used to evade or avoid the tax laws or regulations of other jurisdictions. In its December 2008 report on the use of tax havens by American corporations,[7] the U.S. Government Accountability Office was unable to find a satisfactory definition of a tax haven but regarded the following characteristics as indicative of it: nil or nominal taxes; lack of effective exchange of tax information with foreign tax authorities; lack of transparency in the operation of legislative, legal or administrative provisions; no requirement for a substantive local presence; and self-promotion as an offshore financial center.

A 2012 report from the Tax Justice Network estimated that between USD \$21 trillion and \$32 trillion is sheltered from taxes in unreported tax havens worldwide. If such wealth earns 3% annually and such capital gains were taxed at 30%, it would generate between \$190 billion and \$280 billion in tax revenues, more than any other tax shelter.[8] If such hidden offshore assets are considered, many countries with governments nominally [in debt](#) are shown to be net creditor nations.[9] However, the tax policy director of the Chartered Institute of Taxation expressed skepticism over the accuracy of the figures.[10] A study of 60 large US companies found that they deposited \$166 billion in offshore accounts during 2012, sheltering over 40% of their profits from U.S. taxes.[11]

As you can see, tax havens are an enemy of all the people that receive tax based services, which is nearly everybody. If the state cannot collect those billions and trillions of dollars or rands, then they will not be able to spend them on the people. This is my new foe!

If we were to observe the tax haven, we could make them illegal if we were to find a common term for them, yes? If we were to say that the state they are in gives the 'native company's country' the money from the taxes, with a waiting fee or interest, they would shut them down or pay up. This may be hard to do with the United Nations, so, I suggest they get the World Bank in on this, no?

Now, to define a tax haven, it would be a place where taxes are altered from the native country. If they do not pay the tax to the full, they have altered it, and, need to pay it. Hence the World Bank will surely collect a small fee, so will see it done.

They could also say that if the taxes are set for a country, they must pay them to that country. This would be nearly impossible to police, so, taxes should be deducted off of the company by the bank directly, with a program for this - one that you download patches for each morning or afternoon, like an anti virus?

Work only for commission?

I want to empower the unemployed to make jobs for themselves, but think it might only be possible with the employed, as then the bank has surety. Maybe I have a trick up my sleeve?

If the employed was to go to the employer, and say they want to open a new division of the company, and head it, I am sure the employer or owner will listen, as, the 'employed' person will still be under the boss. This is one way to look at it. The other way would see the employed head off on their own, or, still work and pay for the small business by themselves. The only thing holding this back is lack of interest and a bad attitude!

If the employed person was to head a new division for the company, say it is an IT company - I know we have lots of those! - then they could hire employees at a small amount to write programs for commission. This could be a formal type of contract where it is only commission based and then the state will say, or, should I say the legal representatives, that it is better than nothing. This means there is hardly any cost - a computer or two, they can work from home - and then if the business makes money, they make money related to how much the business makes?

Of course, this will inspire them! This lack of interest shown by the youth who still live with their parents will disappear as they set out to get a commission, or, enough money to start their own businesses. Hell, they could just register the business for 600 rand and see who comes to them! I suggest they just do it from home until they are ready to take the step to be a home owner. I am sure they have the know how if they went to school, and, with their parents employed, they will have access to a tiny bit of capital, say, a notebook or something. Of course, they could get the order, then hire staff?

Now, for the people that are destitute, having not gone to school and not having the means to the end, they would be hard pressed to come up with the same plan. I suggest that the people that are opening the business - those that went to school and live with their employed parents - advertise their service or goods for

themselves. this will be like a one shot going for the kill.

Of course, everybody wants to do the same things. if you were to offer a service which compliments others, you might want to go to the bank to research what sort of business is in demand. the good news is that as soon as somebody opens a business, they need suppliers or customers, and if they need suppliers, you could jump at that chance, yes?

For those that are destitute, they could work for these people that have the means. the people that have [a little bit](#) of capital, say the employed, could all chip together and buy a run down factory for the poorest people to work for them, of course.

If the people that have no money or know how were to come together, they could form a company of workers, like a union. hell they should join the unions of the country! if they were to do this, they would be in line for a job, or, [get a job](#) very soon. if they had a cell phone, they could phone the bank and get in line for those that are hiring. of course, this brings up a whole new way to do things...

If the employed were to school the poorest themselves, say, five rand per person per lesson, they have the time to teach them the basics of life that the city people take for granted. if they were to teach them to read and count, i am sure they could charge them a little bit, and, empower [at the same time](#).

But, what i wanted to do is make a whole new way to do things. if the people right at the bottom were to be given the chances that the lazy youth are given, they would really have a swing at it. the lazy attitude is where they youth get defeated because they cannot [find a job](#) they like. this should be addressed by the state where they would organize a outdoors school in the park where teachers can charge what they want - i am sure some of the lazy youth would give that a go? i call them lazy because there are jobs for them that they could take, but don't. these always end up going to the poorest who really need them. the problem is, if the youth want to count on the capital left by their parents, they would probably open a business when they are older. maybe i shouldn't call them lazy though, i wouldn't take those jobs either!

So, instead of waiting for your parents to die, ask them to help you out now. if they were to provide capital for your small business, they could see you off your ass and into a good position quickly while they are still alive. remember to research which sectors are needy...

Now, for the destitute, i am sure they will get educated and be employable. but, let's say they won't be, let's say they are so poor they cannot afford a five rand for a few lessons in english?

Then, i would say they need to get a petition together. on this petition, they should have a few columns. in these columns they should check the boxes explaining their age, health, location and hours they could work. then, they should send this to the municipality nearest them to have some social workers try to find them work. this would require identification though, so, maybe the state could, with all that money i made available for them, help them get an identity document?

So, they could all wait in a line. not good enough!

If they were to try to offer their shacks as 'store houses,' at a really low rate, i am sure they will come up with a bit of capital quickly! of course, the middle men

that usually store things might go out of work, but i am sure they will have capital in the end to [start a new business](#)👉.